



MEETING MINUTES

February 27, 2018 Workshop-Meeting | 7:00 p.m.
Engineering Conference Room, Woburn City Hall, 10 Common Street, Woburn, MA

Chair Dave Edmonds called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. and asked Planner Karen Smith to conduct a roll call of members.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Mr. Michael Ventresca, Chair Dave Edmonds, Mr. Jim Callahan, and Ms. Carolyn Turner were present. Ms. Claudia Bolgen participated remotely via telephone. Mr. Bob Doherty and Mr. Kevin Donovan were absent. Also present were Planning Director Tina Cassidy and Planner Karen Smith.

Edmonds announced that member Claudia Bolgen will be participating in this meeting remotely, having requested permission on February 23, 2018 to so participate and such permission having been granted. Bolgen indicated she was in receipt of all meeting materials.

Cassidy noted the Planning Department will be making an audio recording of the meeting and it will be made available upon request.

Chair Edmonds suggested a policy of Planning Staff announcing their presence at each meeting for the record.

Director Cassidy announced herself and Planner Karen Smith.

SUBDIVISION APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED PLANS, if any

Chair Edmonds asked Director Cassidy if there were any ANR's. There were none.

WORKSHOP DISCUSSION

Cassidy initiated discussion regarding proposed revisions to current Land Subdivision Rules and Regulations. The intent is to revise the document relative to filing requirements for subdivision plans that will bring applicants up to speed with some of the information that is required. Many of the forms, including covenants and tripartite agreements need to be updated, standardized, and streamlined. She added that it is important to address some of the policy decisions within approved subdivisions that have resulted in some issues in the field such as roadway layouts and street trees.

Cassidy further reviewed sketches of some possible layouts of subdivision roads that will initiate discussion on whether or not the Board needs to define/regulate Collector Street, Cul-de-sac Short, Minor Streets, Primary Arterial Street, Secondary Arterial Street, Type I Street and Type II Streets. Also, discussion needs to include what changes should be made to the Typical Cross-Sections for the various types of streets, in terms of right of way and pavement widths, street trees and grass strips, etc.

Edmonds stated that whatever revisions the Board enacts, he hopes it does not cause angst for the residents and does not want to create anything in this process that will encumber the citizens.

Edmonds reiterated the importance of how the Board should handle paper streets going forward.

Cassidy noted discussion should include how to deal with cases where there is a lot at the end of an existing right of way with a paper street. The Board should consider whether to create new requirements for a situation like that and different requirements for a newly created subdivision on, say, a large open blank parcel of land such as Mr. Murray's Shannon Farm development that has a lot of flexibility in developing the roads.

Edmonds noted the majority of flat land in the city is already developed and what remains is the "hard to develop" land.

Callahan stated that we are also seeing the redevelopment of tear-downs.

Ventresca asked Bolgen if she remembered if ZORC created a policy regarding pork chop lots while mentioning they spent a lot of time discussing it. Bolgen responded she believed it wasn't a new amendment to the subdivision rules, and recalled they were getting many unsuccessful requests for the same type of waivers and people stopped asking as developers realized what was being allowed versus what was not being allowed.

Cassidy stated that some communities allow them as they provide an alternative to a subdivision road which is more pavement, a potential sidewalk, and is more visually disruptive to the neighborhood but is sometimes an interesting tradeoff.

Callahan stated when he was a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals, the city had clear language stating they were not in favor of pork chop lots and conveyed it to the developers.

Cassidy stated when revising and adopting new Subdivision Rules and Regulations it is very important to be clear as to what the Board will allow and will not allow. For example, if the Board adopts a typical roadway layout for a 40' wide road, it must remain firm in that decision. Details need to be discussed, such as will a sidewalk be required on both sides of a cul-de-sac; will it require only one sidewalk; or in the case where there are not any sidewalks in the neighborhood, will the Board allow zero? The Board must be very clear on what it will allow.

Edmonds expressed concern regarding reducing requirements and still receiving requests for waivers.

Ventresca reiterated the necessity for the Board to remain firm with their Rules and Regulations.

Edmonds stated that he agreed with Ventresca and stated although developers often have great arguments it is important when you set rules to stick by them.

Callahan stated that agreed with Edmonds on the principle that the Board must stick by the rules they set while adding the baseline of the subdivision rules is currently in our bylaws and if we relax them we will not have any teeth left.

Callahan further stated that conceding and approving waivers are also bartering tools and feels if the city is going to give up something they should be getting something in return for the city and/or the neighborhood. An example is that, if the Board approves a waiver to reduce a sidewalk of 150-200' at \$150/foot, that money could be put toward the infrastructure of the neighborhood. Otherwise, he agrees in principle with the secondary streets and cul-de-sacs not needing sidewalks all the time, but questions what the city will get in return for it.

Cassidy emphasized the importance of minimizing the impact on the neighborhoods with the possibility of keeping some trees within the development rather than taking them down to build sidewalks.

Bolgen stated that one of the most compelling arguments to come across the Board recently is the request for a waiver that in fact will ultimately be making the street and neighborhood safer. The department heads are submitting comments noting the design is safer, even though it does not meet our Subdivision Rules and Regulations. When looking at new roadway layouts and requirements, we must contemplate whether or not this is this a safety issue. That is the foundation upon which we regulate.

Bolgen further stated that whether she has a personal preference for sidewalks on both sides of a cul-de-sac or not, the bottom line is the safety of the new streets we are creating. When revising our subdivision rules and regulations, we must get a basis for all the city departments as to what is considered a safe street and review each one on a case-by-case basis.

Cassidy stated the possibility of creating a list in the Rules and Regulations as to under what circumstances the board might consider granting waivers. For example, the Departments may provide testimony that granting a waiver would increase public safety and ability to reach residents in an emergency.

Callahan stated that most of the undeveloped lots left in the city contain ledge or have water issues. For example, each parcel owns their water containment within their property. A developer should not increase the water flow off their property causing concern to neighbors. If there is an existing water condition in the neighborhood, and although the developer may have submitted an infiltration system that met the criteria of the Engineering Department, concerned neighbors at the low point of the development may benefit from the placement of concrete structure to appease and improve the situation. One scenario is that by being granted a sidewalk waiver, a developer could use the funds saved on the sidewalk towards improving drainage in the area.

Cassidy stated she, along with Edmonds, received notice from resident Chris Owen, 3 Florence Terrace, Woburn, MA, stating that he will be doing an audio recording of the meeting. Mr. Owen joined the meeting at this time.

Callahan stated there are some standards within our regulations that can be relaxed for a greater concern for the immediate area such as safety, roadway improvement, sightlines, and water retention to ease the concerns of neighbors in the immediate area. The developers usually have the facts to meet the drainage requirements, and while the neighbors may oppose due to their proximity, they don't have the resources.

Cassidy stated that the Board is authorized to call for peer reviews and hire an independent third-party consultant during the hearing to answer concerns of the Board and the neighbors while adding the applicant bears the cost.

Edmonds stated that the Board has hired a consultant in the past to assist with some of the larger projects. He feels certain types of issues may become more frequent due to the fact that most of the remaining developable land in the city is less desirable, while adding that it is important to seek help from the developers in improving certain areas and have hope that they are willing to make compromises if there is an issue that needs to be mitigated.

Cassidy began a discussion regarding the necessity to review rights of way, street trees, and grass strips. She stated that the DPW receives many calls regarding the grass strips that are damaged by sidewalk plows, etc. In the most recent Pearl Street Definitive Subdivision, the applicants were instructed by DPW Superintendent Jay Duran to delete the grass strip on the plan and put the sidewalk directly next to the curb.

Cassidy further stated that this is against what is written in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations and feels it is important to perhaps have Duran in for a conversation. Duran is trying to eliminate people complaining about the damaged grass strips during snow removal and explaining to them that it is their responsibility, not the city's, to maintain the grass strip. Another topic to be discussed is the street trees that are planted within the grass strips as potential discussion should include their proper placement. Shall they be placed next to the curb or set them to the back of the sidewalk?

Edmonds asked Cassidy about the purpose of the grass strips. Cassidy responded they originated as tree belts only to learn they ruin the sidewalk as the roots grow. She added the grass strips have some practical applications as they serve as a place to put snow and trash barrels.

Ventresca stated that grass strips often provide aesthetic value to a neighborhood. He recalled several years ago receiving a directive from the post office stating they would like to see more mail boxes placed at the curb so letter carrier doesn't have to get out of the vehicle. He feels the Board should have the option to require grass strips.

Edmonds stated that they do not have grass strips on Ward Street and stated some areas of his neighborhood do not have any sidewalks. He summarized that a developer often maximizes the number of lots in a subdivision if they are not required to allow footage for grass strips, etc.

Cassidy described three sketches she prepared for the meeting that related to possible changes that may be made to the Typical Cross-Sections for the various types of streets, in terms of right of way and pavement widths, street trees and grass strips. Sketch #1 depicted a layout with possible ideas to develop a 40' right of way, and perhaps limited to two lots. It would allow the Board to require a 4' sidewalk, a grass strip of 3' next to the sidewalk, a 7' wide grass strip on the other side of the road where there isn't a sidewalk, and then on each side of the 40' wide right of way there will be a ten-foot-wide tree easement (tree belt) on private property placing street trees on both sides of the street. The Board currently requires 5' tree belts. The right of way minimum pavement width would be 24' to provide safe two-way traffic.

Cassidy described Sketch#2 noting it contains a 50' right of way with a threshold of less than 6 lots, or we may consider it for less than ten lots. It has a 24' wide pavement, 6-ft. vertical granite curbing, and contains a 3' grass strip, a 4' sidewalk on one side and a 10' grass strip on the portion of the road

that does not have a sidewalk. It proposes a 7' grass strip behind the 4' sidewalk in addition to a 10' wide tree easement on private property outside of the right of way. This idea will move the trees away from the sidewalk and prevent sidewalk damage, but you still have a grass strip that residents may use for any various purposes.

Cassidy presented Sketch#3 noting it is one the Board may want to consider for the larger subdivisions, perhaps an application to develop more than six lots; or a through street that connects to another or back onto itself such as the loop at Shannon Farms. Proposed is a 50' right of way with a pavement width of 28'; with 3' grass strips and curbing on both sides; 4' sidewalks on both sides of the street; and 10' tree belts on private property. Cassidy added that she did not sketch a design idea for what the Board might want to carry in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations for the occasional commercial subdivision application.

Edmonds asked whether Mass General Laws (MGL) allows Planning Boards to control trees.

Cassidy responded that Mass General Laws provide the authority to Planning Boards to require street trees if they choose and also allows them to require preservation of trees in certain circumstances as it has to do with health and protection of environment.

Edmonds asked about to the standard width of a car lane. Callahan responded that 8' is the standard car width while a travel lane is 12' wide.

Cassidy stated that she prefers 24' wide streets for safety reasons.

Ventresca asked Cassidy whether or not she liked the current variations we have in our standards.

Cassidy responded we currently have Type I, II, and III while questioning if an intermediate category is needed.

Callahan stated we have come across the entire litany of options here. He recalled many projects involving paper streets that create problems with developers and we need to know all issues that will be affected in the general vicinity not just the immediate vicinity. We need to recognize it ahead of time and keep within the best interests of the city.

Edmonds recalled a situation with the East Dexter Ave development where it was too costly to continue the sidewalk on one side of the street, so the sidewalk ended, and it was designed to continue on the other side of the street. He did not agree with the waiver when it was granted due to safety reasons as he does not feel it is safe to have people cross the street on a hill in the dark because the sidewalks end.

Callahan stated that is the same area where a developer submitted a preliminary subdivision plan to develop several paper streets in the same neighborhood.

Cassidy stated in that particular instance off East Dexter Ave, keeping the sidewalk on the same side of street would have been more expensive, but there were several driveways and fences on private property that would have had posed an incredible disruption to neighbors had the sidewalk continued on the same side of the street.

Edmonds stressed the importance to always keep the best interest of the city in mind and reemphasized the fact that developers must follow rules.

Cassidy stated there was some discussion and language in the Board's decision that the parcel [off of East Dexter Avenue] was ripe for development and your approval was for access for this specific 41-unit development. However, this does not mean the Board will consider it adequate for any other development. And if they came with that thought, it should have been disallowed back then.

Ventresca stated that we do have current cross sections Type I, II, and III and we need to be more stringent as a Board in our decisions. In some particular cases, such as our recent Flagg Street decision, we need to defer for safety reasons as we made a bad situation better. We need a better understanding and should update the cross sections in our current Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

Edmonds stated there are very few big, flat parcels available to be developed and anything flat that is remaining is wet. Edmonds stated he thinks we are going to be faced with some difficult roadway applications and he does not want to create unsafe situations for our residents.

Callahan stated the necessity for all the different departments to weigh-in professionally and not on their gut opinion on some of these standards that have to be met. It has not been uniform in all cases on previous subdivisions that have come in front of the Planning Board and he feels they ought to be more careful.

Cassidy asked if Callahan felt we are reaching out to the right departments. Callahan responded the departments are accessed properly but does not think they are basing their decisions in a professional manner that can be substantiated in court.

Edmonds asked clarity questioning if someone objected to a decision they made. Callahan responded that there are standards at all levels of the City government and everyone should be following those standards and not what they feel is right personally and looking at how things are going to be developed when they weigh a decision and an opinion.

Edmonds stated his attorney in Boston on the Electrical Board always asks, "Is this a consistent application of the rules?"

Turner asked for clarification from Callahan, asking if he is stating that if there is a decision from a City department and within that decision, or some part of that decision, is based on something that is not founded or based on some legal principal? Or if there is a variation of a legal principal or code, or some other ordinance, assuming a reference to a code or regulation, that should be contained within that decision for us to consider?

Turner stated that Callahan's background may contain knowledge of certain provisions while, collectively, we are not all knowledgeable of all of the different codes and regulations that we need to be or should be considered within a proposal.

Bolgen stated that Callahan is possibly referring to things that are not reduced to codes, etc. but for example, referring to Sketch#1 depicting a 24' pavement within a 30 foot right of way, would there be circumstances when police or fire would say 18' or 22' pavement width is fine without any

consistent application. She added that the basic safety issue of roads is cars. Which factors are considered if Police and Fire maintain in a certain circumstance that 22' right-of-way is safe?

Cassidy stated the Fire Department adheres to a State regulation requiring any way providing access to a building must be at least 20' wide. Quite often, we are now finding the Fire Department is accepting anything with a minimum width of 20 feet wide. That regulation might have been referring to an alley next to a ten-story building in Boston and not necessarily a subdivision road in Woburn.

Cassidy further stated that inviting the Police and Fire Departments in to talk about that issue would be beneficial as they may not be thinking beyond that regulation and considering if it would be safer if it was 24' wide for two-way traffic. The Board needs to remain firm with our new rules and feel confident that the Departments are on board with us. Otherwise, it is only going to undermine the ability of the Board to demand 24' widths for two-way traffic if departments are going to say 20' is fine.

Edmonds stated in his line of work, he can trump the State regulations if OSHA rules are more stringent.

Edmonds asked Cassidy as to who makes the call in the Board's situation. Cassidy responded that the Board approves a subdivision and is allowed to be more stringent and may inform the Fire Department they appreciate their input and realize you technically only need a 20' minimum pavement width to get there in a crisis. The Board's view needs to be broader and need to consider the more practical use of a parked car and traffic and not just the occasional fire truck on an emergency visit. She added that it is much more cohesive if the Departments understand an appreciation of where we sit and, at a minimum, the Fire Department will mention the 20' reference, but in a residential case the 24' will be safer and more convenient.

Edmonds asked about a developer's ability to be successful in taking the Board to court defending the Fire Departments 20' foot requirement. Cassidy responded they could always try and emphasized that is why the Board needs to be logical, thoughtful and consistent in the application process as all those things become factors when a judge looks at a case.

Bolgen stated that she agrees with Cassidy comments and stressed the importance of having a conversation with the Police and Fire Department to get an idea where these recommendations are coming from to be able to place them in context. She added that it is important for the Board to discuss the safety issues involved with roadway widths for a variety of applications in the city.

Bolgen further stated that she recalls, during the recent Flagg Street Subdivision application, reading a rule stating our focus is on protecting the safety of our community, adding it can be difficult in the moment to say I don't think it is fine when you have Police and Fire saying "X" feet will be fine

Cassidy stated that department head meetings during the application process is often helpful and may result in good reviews of certain projects.

Ventresca refers the conversation back to the sketches.

Cassidy suggests she will provide sketches in smaller versions for everyone to see and feels after the Board completes its discussion it will be beneficial to invite Department of Public Works (DPW)

Superintendent Jay Duran and City Engineer Jay Corey, in addition to the Police and Fire Department, to a Board meeting to discuss these issues.

Edmonds stressed the issue of public safety is important to him and stated he prefers 28' roadway widths for major subdivisions in that it provides parking and easy access for cars to pass. He would like to eliminate possible hazards for public safety officials.

Ventresca summarized his thoughts saying he likes 24' wide roads on short cul-de-sacs, adding that he feels that less than or equal to two lots per sketch is useful for him to see. But he wonders how to deal with six lots. He questions where a sidewalk would be placed if it's only on one side in a cul-de-sac.

Cassidy stated the Board now requires 4' sidewalks on both sides of a 40' right-of-way. Referring to Sketch#1, she pointed out we are gaining four feet of pavement in exchange for one of the sidewalks essentially. The Board must also consider if six is the right number, suggesting three on each side, and to keep in mind the scenario of duplexes in R-2 zones noting sidewalks normally go to the midpoint of the cul-de-sac. It is beneficial to choose the side with less disruption to place the sidewalk.

Bolgen suggested discussing the pros and cons of more sidewalks versus less sidewalks. She noted that having sidewalks on both sides of cul-de-sacs would result in people would having the ability to walk out of their house and walk to the end of the street on the sidewalk without having to cross the street. This is in addition to more opportunity for children ride bikes on either side of the street, or things of that nature. The upside of having less sidewalk is the preclusion of more impermeable surfaces.

Cassidy stated short cul-de-sacs normally have great visibility and a small number of houses and therefore may not need sidewalks on both sides of the street. She added that she is not sure whether that would tip the argument over. There is room in the 40' right-of-way sketch to add a sidewalk on both sides but noted it would be adding impervious pavement. She suggested perhaps that the standard could be to have two sidewalks but the Board may entertain waivers of standards if an environmental benefit can be shown and there is no significant detriment to a waiver.

Edmonds asked for clarification as to whether the city, once street acceptance occurs, also owns the sidewalks. Cassidy responded that the city will own everything in the right-of-way including utilities, sidewalk, and curbing. She added that both 3' and 7' grass strips are within the public right-of-way and are city-owned while the tree belts are on private property and are not owned by the city.

Bolgen questioned the reasoning behind having a grass strip on the side of the cu-de-sac that does not have a sidewalk. Cassidy responded that it seems as though it was an appropriate alternative to add the grass strip if that area of land wasn't being used for a sidewalk. And you would be reducing the right-of-way from 40' to 33' feet.

Bolgen questioned what public service the 7' grass strip provides when in reality it is basically just going to be part of someone's lawn. Cassidy responded that a benefit would be the fact that it is a permeable surface and would add aesthetic value to the neighborhood.

Bolgen stated applying 4' of that 7' grass strip to create a 28' wide right-of-way would create more parking spaces and increase safety in allowing cars to pass while adding additional room for snow

storage. She contemplated the benefits of creating a sidewalk versus the importance of wider travel lanes for cars.

Bolgen further stated that it is important, from a policy standpoint, to define what the Board's objectives are moving forward for the next 10 to 30 years as we are building roads. Is it to make it easier for cars to navigate in the city and/or is it to reduce permeable surface? These greater policy goals are what we must struggle with.

Ventresca suggested ideas of adjusting the width of the grass strips.

Cassidy discussed the possibility of increasing the roadway pavement width noting it would add back in some more impervious pavement allowing additional parking and area for cars to travel.

Bolgen again raised the topic of sidewalks on both sides of the road, questioning whether the 7' grass strip is more important than the sidewalk. Bolgen noted the importance for the Board to create their best case for each component of a proposed design as they may likely be challenged at every aspect by the various departments when asking for their input.

Callahan stated, to his knowledge, the City of Woburn does not shovel or plow sidewalks on any minor street in the city. The damaged grass shouldn't be repaired by the city if there is a sidewalk with a curb in it. The city plows the sidewalks on the major streets and all the major thoroughfares going to and from the schools.

Callahan further stated that the City does not plow the sidewalks on the minor subdivisions that we are discussing, therefore, the city may not be responsible for that specific damage or repair unless there isn't a curb and the snow plows are going up onto someone's property. One personal note, a developer in his neighborhood, on a main street, did not put in a sidewalk and grassed up to the backside of the curb and also put boulders there so people are unable to walk, which causes a disconnect on the sidewalk on both ends. It is public property.

Callahan further stated that the Board has to be careful with all of its decisions and think of a way to enforce rules and regulations so that someone doesn't put something there, such as paving over a 7' wide tree belt to be used as an area to park a car.

Cassidy stated she has been thinking of the 10' wide tree belt and wondered if putting language in a deed restriction would put people on notice regarding the street trees that are in the tree belt within the subdivision. Specifically, informing them the street trees are not yours to take down and the City has the right, but maybe not the obligation, to enter onto the property and maintain the trees. Also, to be included in the document will be explicit and clear language stating the grass strip is yours to maintain and will not be maintained by the City. Added this language may reduce the number of calls to the DPW.

Ventresca responded to Cassidy's comment, stating we need to be firm in that wording if we have a grass strip that it is the resident's responsibility to maintain. He added that he agrees with Bolgen in having sidewalks on both sides of a short cul-de-sac.

Cassidy stated she will make reduced-size version of her sketches and will email them to members for their review and consideration of ideas.

Bolgen stated in the future we are going to be asked to deal with the miscellaneous properties that are left to develop in the city. We must ponder what it is that we are prioritizing. Are we prioritizing cars? Are we prioritizing other forms of transportation such as walking and bicycling? What are our priorities in designing our streets—the short variety and the longer variety—because those policy decisions are implicit in what we ask developers to do.

Edmonds stated there was discussion at the recent eTOD Commerce Way meeting regarding potential ways to going to transport people in this area such as rail stations, bicycles and walking paths.

Cassidy stated when trying to tackle the traffic, you have to offer people an alternative. In a short cul-de-sac, where you don't have a lot of traffic and/or pedestrians, perhaps the environmental issues take precedence.

Bolgen stressed the importance of questioning what are we prioritizing while adding it is also important to consider the environmental component, the human-powered transportation component, and the automobile component, as they are all at play here in what the Board is choosing to prioritize.

Bolgen stated she would be interested in learning what similar communities have thought about on a broader scale as to what roadways, rights-of-way, and human-powered transportation ideas they want to see in the future and wondered if local communities have recently updates their Rules and Regulations.

Cassidy asked the Board for recommendations as to similar surrounding communities for comparison and received suggestions from Board members including Wilmington, Stoneham, Melrose, Belmont and Watertown.

Bolgen suggested once the Board sets its priorities as to if it chooses to prioritize safety of car traffic, or safety of human-powered traffic, or if it favors sidewalks and/or cross strips, when the Board encounters the issue of paper streets, such as an inadequately designed paper street, these priorities will inform our decision-making there as to what we are going to prioritize in that situation, as well.

Edmonds stated the Board may discover some paper streets cannot exist because they do not meet the requirements to be developed out.

Bolgen stated it is important to decide going forward how we are going to deal with paper streets that are inadequate.

Callahan asked Cassidy if she has reached out to various department to see if they have any concerns or suggestions in the Subdivision Rules and Regulation application process. Cassidy responded that she did meet with department heads on a couple of occasions with great contributions from Police, Fire, DPW, and Engineering and added a second review will be beneficial. She also mentioned the importance to add language that it is mandatory to record covenants and to put cross references on approval letters.

SUBDIVISIONS

RUSSO ESTATES SUBDIVISION / William Scire

Cassidy updated members regarding the Bank's request for signatures on all pages of the definitive subdivision plan Mylar sheets and also the need for members' signatures on the MGL Chapter 41 Section 81-X Certificate for recordation.

Turner asked Cassidy to clarify the MGL Chapter 41 Section 81-X Certificate regarding Scrivener's errors. Cassidy explained that the Scrivener's error related specifically to the basement elevation discrepancy on the detail sheet of the Mylar (numbers specific to one - but only one - of the houses was initially included and was rightfully removed from the "typical detail").

Cassidy recommended that the Board endorse the provided Mylars and execute the required M.G.L. Chapter 41, Section 81-X Certificate.

Motion made by Ventresca to accept the Director's recommendation to endorse the provided Mylars and execute the required M.G.L. Chapter 41, Section 81-X Certificate;

Seconded by Bolgen;

Roll call vote on the Motion: Bolgen - in favor
Turner - in favor
Ventresca - in favor
Callahan - in favor
Edmonds - in favor

Motion carried, 5-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Cassidy recommend deferring the approval of the February 13, 2018 minutes until the Planning Board's next meeting on March 13, 2018. Board members responded in agreement.

PLANNING DIRECTOR UPDATE

Cassidy discussed the positive feedback that was received from the public during the eTOD Commerce Way Public Forum.

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m. made by Bolgen;

Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the Motion: Bolgen - in favor
Turner - in favor
Ventresca - in favor
Callahan - in favor
Edmonds - in favor

Motion carried, 5-0.

Table of Documents Used at Meeting

2002 Woburn Planning Board Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations
Draft 2/22/18 "Woburn Planning Board's Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land 2018 Edition
Russo Estates: Copy of Certification Under MGL Chapter 41 Section 81-X Form
Draft Meeting Minutes: February 13, 2018

Respectfully submitted,



Karen Smith